UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,051	07/30/2007	Matthieu Helft	022702-151	6187
21839 7590 03/13/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404			EXAMINER	
			LISTVOYB, GREGORY	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/562,051	HELFT ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	GREGORY LISTVOYB	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 Ju</u>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 19-40 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 19-40 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access	vn from consideration. relection requirement.	-xaminer			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Extended in the contraction of the contracti	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/23/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The dependent Claim 33 depends on itself, i.e. the same Claim 33.

For examination purposes it has been assumed that Claim 33 depends on Claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 19-21, 23-25, 27-34, 35-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Landoll et al (US 4254207) herein Landoll or Bentley et al (US 4102846) herein Bentley.

Landoll discloses a process for preparing spherical polyamide particles having a mean diameter of less than 1 mm (5-100 um, see Column 6, line 25, meeting the limitations of claims 35-403), comprising the following steps:

a) preparing a dispersion of a first liquid which comprises polyamide monomers, such as caprolactam (see Column 4, line 5), adipic acid (see Column 4, line 50) and hexamethylenediamine (see Column 3, line 35), meeting the limitations of Claim 23 in a second inert liquid (hydrocarbon C5-C10, see Column 5, line 55. In case of C9 and C10 paraffinic hydrocarbon the boiling point exceeds 150C, meeting the limitations of Claim 24, see also Example 1, where butanediol was used at 160-180C);

b) polymerizing the monomers by polycondensation by heating the reaction medium and maintaining the heating at a temperature below the melting point of the polyamide with the desired degree of polymerization (see Column 6, line 5).

Bentley discloses a process for preparing spherical polyamide particles having a mean diameter of less than 1 mm (Abstract, 1 um, see Example 1), comprising the following steps:

a) preparing a dispersion of a first liquid which comprises polyamide monomers, such as lactam (see Example 1), Nylon 6,6 salt (the same as one in the Application examined), in a high boiling hydrocarbon (the boiling point exceeds 150C, meeting the limitations of Claim 24, see Examples);

Art Unit: 1796

b) polymerizing the monomers by polycondensation by heating the reaction medium and maintaining the heating at a temperature below the melting point of the polyamide with the desired degree of polymerization (see Examples) for 35 min, while distilling out forming water in azeotrope (see Examples).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-21, 23-25, 27-34, 35-40 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara et al (US 6127513) herein Ohara.

Ohara discloses a process containing the steps (a) and (b) of claim 1 (see Example 1). In addition, Ohara's process includes washing and drying procedure (see Example 1).

Ohara teaches the second solvent (xylene), which added after the polymerization (see Example 1). However, ohara does not teach that the second solvent is added before the polymerisation stars.

The position is taken that the above solvent can be added before the polymerisation, since it assists in better dispersion of polyamide monomers, which facilitates the polymerization rate.

Claim 22, 32-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landoll or Bentley in combination with Okazaki et al (US 3446782) herein Okazaki.

Landoll or Bentley disclose a process for preparing spherical polyamide particles having a mean diameter of less than 1 mm:

- a) preparing a dispersion of a first liquid which comprises polyamide monomers, such as caprolactam, adipic acid and hexamethylenediamine in a second inert liquid
- b) polymerizing the monomers by polycondensation by heating the reaction medium and maintaining the heating at a temperature below the melting point of the polyamide with the desired degree of polymerization.

Landoll or Bentley do not disclose the first liquid comprising a solution of monomers in water.

Okazaki discloses a process of manufacture of powdery synthetic linear polyamides, where dispersion media for monomers is water (see Example 1). Okazaki teaches that use of aqueous solution minimize a polymer degradation, decreases a cost of solvents (Column 4, line 20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to use water in Landoll or Bentley's process, since it creates an azeotrope, which facilitates solvent removal.

Regarding claims 32-34, Okazaki discloses washing and drying process for his polyamide particles (see Example 6)

Claims 19- 22, 25- 27, 31, 35-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montasser (WO01/68235, cited with equivalent US 2003/0059473) herein Montasser.

Montasser discloses a process for preparing spherical polyamide particles having a mean diameter of less than 1 um, comprising the following steps:

- a) preparing a dispersion of a 10-90% of the first liquid (organic, see lines 0023 and 0041, Example 1) which comprises polyamide monomer, in a second inert liquid (aqueous, See line 0042);
- b) polymerizing the monomers by polycondensation and/or polyaddition by heating the reaction medium and maintaining the heating at a temperature below the melting point of the polyamide with the desired degree of polymerization (see Abstract).

Montasser discloses that solvents can be removed by distillation

Montasser does not teach that both polyamide monomers dispersed in the first liquid. Instead he teaches that the second monomer is dispersed in the second liquid (see Abstract). He teaches that his process takes place at 5 fold excess of the second monomer (see line 0011), which is clearly constitutes a disadvantage of the above process. In addition, this process is applicable only for diamines soluble in water.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to place both monomers into organic phase in order to decrease excess of a diamine and increase applicability of the process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY LISTVOYB whose telephone number is (571)272-6105. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/562,051 Page 8

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rabon Sergent/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

GL

Application/Control Number: 10/562,051

Page 9

Art Unit: 1796